



REDMOND PARK BOARD



Meeting Minutes March 2, 2006 Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

I. Call to order/Welcome to Citizen Guests

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Chair Lori Snodgrass at 7:02 p.m.

Board members present: Chairperson Snodgrass; Co-chair: Kelsey; Board members: Margeson, Stewart, Dige, and Youth Advocates Duncanson and Thomas.

Absent and Excused: Parks Director, Craig Larsen; Board members Ladd and Bourguignon

City staff present: Tim Cox, Parks Planning; Debra Churchill, Recreation; Sarah Stiteler, Planning and Community Development; and Sharon Sato, Recording Secretary.

II. Approval of Minutes

Board members made the following changes/corrections/additions to the January 2, 2006 minutes:

- Addition of Jean Rice and Tom Trueblood as staff attendees
- Page 3 - end of paragraph, Snodgrass asked who issued variance for the stormwater tie in, response from Brunnell, City of Redmond
- Page 4 - 3rd paragraph - second sentence - Snodgrass noted there were no measurement devices close to the cabin structures themselves
- Page 9 - 2nd paragraph - Tom Gorman, former Davis Cup Captain and Olympic Coach

Motion by approve January 2, 2006 minutes as amended: Margeson

Second by: Stewart

Approved: 5-0

Board members made the following changes/corrections/additions to the February 2, 2006 minutes:

- Add to "excused and absent" Thomas
- Correction in spelling of "Digi", should read "Dige"

- Page 2 - last paragraph - first sentence - "within and outside of the park....."
- Page 3 - second paragraph - "another suggestion option "is" to pump...."
- Page 4 - paragraph 5 - "the Board suggested a more.....", should read "the Design Review Board suggested a more...."
- Page 5 - Paragraph 5 - "(double the size....)", should read, "(three times the size....)"
- Page 7 - bullet 4 - "Park Board can speak on....", should read, "Park Board can speak to..."
- Page 8 - last bullet - should be stand alone paragraph, Board took a "straw" vote

Motion to approve the February 2, 2006 minutes as amended: Margeson

Second by: Stewart

Motion carried: 5-0 unanimous

III. Items from the Audience

None

IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts

WRPA/ORPA Conference, Citizen Board Member Pre-Institute - Board members are welcome to attend. April 24, 2006, 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Vancouver Hilton, \$69. Board members are invited to attend. Contact Tim Cox for information.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Education Hill Neighborhood - "Draft" Parks Policies - Stiteler

Stiteler reported the Planning Commission (PC) is currently reviewing the proposed recommendations submitted by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and would be doing so until the end of March. After the Board's review, recommendations will be forwarded onto City Council for review.

The CAC began working on the vision for the Education Hill Neighborhood in fall 2004, their recommendations were then forwarded to the PC for their recommendations. The PC has since requested further clarification by the Park Board on specific policies dealing with Parks and Recreation.

Board members were given excerpts of the proposed recommendations/actual policy language that are specific to Parks, Recreation and Open Space (also included was the Issues Matrix used by the PC) for their review and comments:

NEH 10: Concern was raised regarding the year round food service in and around Hartman Park. Original language included the wording, "encourage" as a result of feedback from the December Open House. Not meaning to specifically focus on vendor food sales, but to encourage gathering place emphasizing the non-active elements of the park, to draw citizens for other non-passive activities (et. al., coffee, conversation) on a year round basis.

Stewart spoke of her concern of a potential gathering place at Hartman as it exists, adjacent to parking lot, too far from where concession stands are currently located (She noted that year round activity is centered more to the south.). She suggested portable/mobile concession stands with removal off site during non-activity hours. Stewart indicated that language might suggest the food/beverage component would be appropriate for this gathering place, adding more picnic benches to make a more inviting picnic environment in appropriate areas of the park.

Kelsey added he is opposed to the sales of food and beverages on or near Hartman Park. However, he had no objection to Policy NEH 9, with the omission of, "such as food concessions...", and was open to any proposal being evaluated and discussed at the time of request or master planning of the park. Kelsey also noted there might be problems with selling food/beverages at this site, with the existing concession currently onsite.

Margeson clarified the question, "is year round sale of food and beverages, in any park, including Hartman Park a vision of the Park Board"?

Stewart noted that food and beverage service needs to link to a specific planned activities at the park and that language should include, "an opportunity to provide a legal mechanism for people to have access to food and beverages during a series of planned events".

Margeson summarized that parents/people are at Hartman Park during games to watch sports, not to buy concessions; but having a concession stand in close proximity to lower fields would add to the ease and time of walking to the concession stand at upper Hartman Park.

Dige commented she liked the idea of a vendor that would sell tea/coffee and muffins to accommodate the adults of children using the playground. She noted she had a concern regarding loitering.

Duncanson commented that, during summer months Marymoor Park allowed portable vendors; she felt that during the warmer months portable vendors at Hartman Park would be welcome during the lunch hour for high school students.

Snodgrass noted that current policy reflects that any concession approval/activity is at the discretion of the Parks Director. Idylwood and Hartman Parks are the only two City parks allowing vendors at built facilities.

Churchill responded that the department has a current system in place, allowing concessions on an activity basis only, using a Miscellaneous Use Permit. Approval is based on a case by case basis; careful monitoring deemed suitable.

Snodgrass added that initial discussion was focused on portable kiosk type carts and that decisions would be based on a case to case basis with review by the Park Board, and final approval/non-approval by the Parks Director. Snodgrass felt the wording of "consider" is appropriate, as a recommendation that it would be considered and would leave in play the actual policies and procedures established. She commented the process is consistent, that current specifics are not based on year round users and would be recommended on a specific, limited user, basis.

Stiteler reiterated if there is year round use, each case would be reviewed carefully and considered on a specific user basis, would allow additional opportunity for the direct neighborhood community to comment. Information given to staff and the Board will be reviewed for comments and recommendations to be made.

NEH 11 - PSE Trail - made general, need to master plan in ways which the Power Line Trail could be enhanced, assuming lease extension. Identical language relating to trail on adjoining neighborhood would allow common benefit for both neighborhoods. Next step will entail moving forward to Planning Commission with recommendation and approval by the Park Board.

Stiteler used the Redmond policy as an example of keeping a sense of openness, but more specific in terms of what might happen in the future.

Snodgrass added that feedback, based on Trails Commission and Parks Board Feedback, is an opportunity to connect the existing trail network to allow connections between neighborhoods and provide easy physical access to/around potential trail areas.

NEH 14 - Lighting - Kelsey commented that he has reservations and would like proposals to come forward for Park Board review, comment, city staff input, neighborhood comment, and affect on park use, before approved.

Margeson gave some background on the Policy issue. The proposal was formed from the concern regarding illegal night time activities occurring at Nike Park. Installing low intensity lights (et. al Hartman Park), for safety, is being discussed.

Cox added that lighting could enable neighborhood to monitor problems and solve some problems, however, lighting can also attract after hours use and increase problems. Poor visibility from the street to the interior of the park is a contributing factor.

Stewart suggested the policy needed to be clarified or amplified. She commented that policy goal is to provide all city parks with a safe and secure environment for neighbors and users; and implement tools, plans, and techniques that promote safety and security. She suggested possibly "re-thinking" Nike Park; layout, visibility, rather than adding lighting.

Snodgrass responded that the Park Board would review and make recommendations based on any specific requests; not opposed to adding low intensity, or cost effective lighting in appropriate areas for appropriate usage. ***Snodgrass requested maintenance staff attend a future Board meeting to give feedback and recommendations on what could possibly be done for Nike Park.***

Margeson noted that community parks have low level safety lighting; neighborhood parks do not, and that this may not be in the general plan. He indicated his support for lighting in both types of parks.

Stiteler recommended that "when appropriate" be added to the language, which would require standard processing and give flexibility in evaluating the situation.

Staff will check with the Police Dept. to see if there are any specific items, on file, in regards to any disturbances at Nike and report back to the Board.

NEH 15: City to promote corporate use and promotion in Parks, with some sponsorship of major activities (et. al. RedmondLights). Promotion by corporations would encourage daytime employees to, more often, use parks, including ownership and general enjoyment use, and encouraging more interest and involvement.

Snodgrass agreed with the suggestion; encouraging the Parks Dept. to consider an additional group to promote parks by corporate, however, has a concern in allowing corporate use and limiting public access by general public.

Margeson agreed with promoting corporate gatherings at the parks, and felt this was the primary intent of the policy, adding this encourages use of Redmond City parks, rather than King County parks (et. al. Marymoor).

Churchill reported the City is doing outreach to corporate entities to promote Redmond. The City is working with hotels to share more information on meeting spaces and other city services and to further create better ways to meet the needs of corporate and encourage stronger partnership.

Snodgrass encouraged staff to create a program that connects with small businesses.

Stewart felt it was important to clarify and emphasize that historical users would not be replaced/assert by new market group.

Kelsey inquired if the City has enough facilities to promote more community and corporate organizations. Churchill responded it would be determined by date and time of year. Staff has built in measures to keep from overloading services; this entails careful management.

No objections from Park Board on current wording.

B. Anderson Park Water Treatment Facility - Process

Cox summarized the process schedule for the Anderson Park Water Treatment Facility:

- February 22 - Planning and Public Works Committee
- March 9 - Parks and Human Services Committee
- March 14 - Council Study Session

Snodgrass encouraged Park Board members to attend the March 14 Council Study Session, 7:30 p.m. to give feedback to Council. She also encouraged the Board to directly contact Council members prior to March 14, to relay Park Board concerns.

Kelsey felt this program had been delayed and is now moving forward quickly. He added that four members of the Council were in attendance at the February 22 Planning and Public Works meeting and felt the Council supported moving the facility offsite, however their concerns was based on cost and the consideration of possible condemnation. He felt that Public Works was willing to accommodate the request. The costs for additional funding amortized over 1-year, would be approximately \$7.00 per household, or 5-years, approximately \$3.25 per household.

Stewart added that the program of updating the well system would increase by approximately 10% to 15% and the impact of the value of Anderson Park out-weighs the 10%-15% increase.

Snodgrass encouraged the public to contact the Mayor's office to support additional funding to move the facility offsite.

Thomas commented that he would like to see the facility located off-site, added he felt the structure was too large for the small site and not visually appealing.

Motion by: Margeson that the Park Board officially request that the City Council relocate the water treatment facility outside of Anderson Park.

Second by: Kelsey

Unanimous: 5-0 (+2 Youth Advocates)

Absent: 2-0

Kelsey suggested letters of comment, either in support of or against, from the two absent Park Board members.

- C. Downtown Neighborhood Parks Assessment Process (SWOT)
Tabled until next month.

VI. New Business

- A. Grass Lawn Park, Phase III Introduction

Cox reported that five consulting firms were contacted to submit proposals for the preliminary design of Phase III of the Grass Lawn Park project on January 31. Consultant deadline is March 7, 2006. Selected consultants will final design, prepare construction documents, detailed cost estimates, and finalize any required permitting. Key elements include: removal of existing house, addition of public restrooms, maintenance and operations space, indoor/outdoor community gathering space; additional parking on 148th Street lot; and possible recreational amenities (play area) in the northeast portion of park. Improvements would be in conjunction with the Grass Lawn Neighborhood policy. Budget is estimated at \$1.2 million, improvements will be designed by budget.

After selection of the consultant, staff will come before the Park Board to begin the public process. The Board will give direction as pertains to site planning, needs, and final plan for City Council approval. Construction would begin in 2007.

- B. Recreation Community Indicators and Semi-Annual Report

Churchill noted that staff would be coming to update the Board on a semi-annual or quarterly basis. She called attention to the handout and pointed out some barriers/challenges on number reporting and the difference in way indicators are reported. As in past, numbers were based on sections (families, parent child programs, seniors, teens), reports are now based on specifics (ages 5 and under, etc.). Better

records are being kept now with new systems and technology to provide more accurate records. Current numbers include outdoor facilities programs - Fun Factory, Idylwood Park Beach users, seasonals, special events (weather may be an indicator of participation numbers). Many program numbers cannot be identified such as walk-ins at facilities - Sr. Center, visitors to Farrell McWhirter Park, spectators at Hartman Park, Teen Center, etc. Only programs with counting systems in place are identified in the community indicators. Numbers are growing with increased population - seniors 41% (50+); 20-49 yrs. 68.5% growth; 13-19, 12.9% growth; 5-12 yrs., 16%; 5 yrs. and under, 6.5% growth - Redmond is comparative to national numbers. The City is providing and meeting the demands of growth in providing quality services. Churchill added that pooling resources with other entities provides the best service to customers. Staff is working into how to obtain numbers for residents vs. non-residents, corporation and tourism, which is an important part of the final data.

VII. Reports

- A. Parks and Human Services Committee
No report.
- B. CIP Projects
No report.
- C. City Reports and Findings
No report.

VIII. Coming Attractions

- A. Redmond Transportation Master Plan
The Board has asked Cox to invite Public Works staff to attend to provide more information.
- B. Redmond Downtown High Capacity Transit Report
- C. Joint Meeting w/Arts Commission

IX. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Margeson
Second by: Stewart
Approved: 5-0

Meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

By: _____ Date: _____
Lori Snodgrass, Chair

Redmond Park Board

March 2, 2006

Page 9

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Sharon Sato

Next Regular Meeting

April 6, 2006

7:00 p.m.

City Hall Building - 15670 NE 85th St.

Council Conference Room - 1st Floor